

### **I. DRAWINGS**

The examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include reference character (728) in figure 7, which is not mentioned in the description. Applicant has amended the specification to include mention of reference character 728.

### III. REMARKS

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

1. The examiner rejected claims 15-44 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the examiner's rejection.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

2. The examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6-7, 13-15, 17, 20-21, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou et al. (US Publication 2002/0159092, "Christodoulou") in view of Ferlitsch et al. (US Publication 2004/0190042, "Ferlitsch").

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation "using a computer, performing the following steps." Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 15, and 29 to add the limitation "placing each of the plurality of document pages into an appropriate holding queue for an appropriate printer" and to show that the plurality of print jobs are printed on "a plurality" of appropriate printers. Applicant submits that Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, individually or in combination do not disclose individual queues for print job types where the documents pages are held in queue, and sent to an appropriate printer. The pages are then printed in response to a computer and not the printer.

3. The examiner rejected claims 2, 16, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, and in view of well known prior art. The examiner rejected claims 4, 18, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, and further in view of Sasso (US 4,591,146, "Sasso"). The examiner rejected claims 5, 19, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, and

further in view of Burns et al. (US 6,707,950, "Burns"). Applicant submits that these dependent claims depend from allowable independent claims.

4. The examiner rejected claims 8, 22, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, and in further view of Kujirai et al. (US 7,072,071, "Kujirai"). Applicant submits that Kujirai does not disclose comparing to a printer page threshold. Kujirai, determines whether printing of all jobs has been completed, and if not, cuts the print job. 15:54-59. This is not the same as comparing to a printer page threshold.

5. The examiner rejected claims 9-12, 23-26, and 39-42 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christodoulou and Ferlitsch, and in further view of Yoshikawa (US 6,132,116, "Yoshikawa"). Yoshikawa discloses a quantifying means that analyzes the print data to be printed and quantifies it to an index representing complexity. Applicant submits that the examiner's interpretation of quantifying means as "calculating the time" is incorrect since, as stated in Yoshikawa 5:3-14, 15: 65-67; and 16:1-6, the quantifying means does not control when a print job is sent to a particular computer based on a calculation of the time until the printer is available.


#### **Double Patenting**

6. The examiner provisionally rejected claims 29-44 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-34 and 37-50 of copending Application No. 10/631,063. Applicant has amended independent claim 29 to overcome the rejection.

#### **Conclusion**

7. Applicant submits that the claims are now in condition for allowance. If the examiner has any questions, applicant request the examiner call applicant's attorney at 214-2321-4703 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Rudolf O. Siegesmund

Registration No. 37,720

Gordon & Rees LLP

Suite 2800

2100 Ross Avenue

Dallas, Texas 75201

214-231-4660

214-461-4053 (fax)

[rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com](mailto:rsiegesmund@gordonrees.com)